



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,339	10/21/1999	THOMAS G. WOOLSTON	11092-012001	5419

20985 7590 06/09/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE
SUITE 500
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

BROWN, TIMOTHY M

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/422,339	THOMAS G. WOOLSTON, ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tim Brown	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is responsive to Applicants' amendment submitted November 12, 2002 ("Applicants' Amendment").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 27, 29, 30, 48, 49, 51 and 52 made under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) have been withdrawn in response to Applicants' Amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicants' arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. **Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 27, 29, 30, 48, 49, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD¹ in view of Net Nanny.²**

Regarding claim 1, HFD teaches a computer-implemented method for encouraging users of a computer network to access dynamic pricing information on the computer network, the method comprising distributing to one or more users of the computer network a modular computer program that presents dynamic pricing information collected from the computer network (page 1, paragraphs 5 and 9) and presenting to the one or more users of the modular computer program an interactive

¹ "GE Commits to Quick Response: Dealers get opportunity to check firm's stock around the clock; deliveries within 48 hours" HFD The Weekly Home Furnishings Newspaper" (August 5, 1991), p. 105.

² "Free Net Nanny Filtering Software Offered With Norton Utilities 4.0 During Six Week On-line Retail Promotion" PR Newswire (May 26, 1999), p. 7807.

visual indication of a user-attractive resource available on the computer network (page 1, paragraphs 7, 9 and 11; and page 2, paragraph 3).

HFD does not expressly teach distributing the modular computer program over a computer network. However, Net Nanny teaches downloading software over the Internet (page 1). Downloading software over the Internet would enable HFD's dealer customers to obtain its pricing software almost instantaneously. Therefore, at the time of Applicants' invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify HFD to include distributing the modular computer program over a computer network as taught by Net Nanny.

HFD does not expressly teach providing an incentive, independent of the dynamic pricing information, to use the modular computer program. However, Net Nanny discloses promoting the sale of a selected software product by offering free software that is unrelated to the selected software product (page 1). Offering a collateral benefit, such as free inventory management software, would enable HFD to increase sales by making its software more appealing. Therefore, at the time of Applicants' invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify HFD to include providing an incentive, independent of the dynamic pricing information, to use the modular computer program.

Regarding claim 3, HFD further teaches collecting dynamic pricing information from the computer network (page 1, paragraph 9).

Regarding claim 7, HFD teaches distributing the modular computer program by enabling users of the computer network to pull a copy of the modular computer program (page 1, paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 27, HFD teaches a computer-implemented system for encouraging users of a computer network to access dynamic pricing information on the computer network, the system comprising a plurality of sources of dynamic pricing information (page 1, paragraph 9), a modular computer program comprising instructions to perform the operations of receiving dynamic pricing information from the plurality of dynamic pricing information sources (page 1, paragraph 9), displaying the received dynamic pricing information to a user of the modular computer program (page 1, paragraphs 2, 7 and 9) and presenting to the user of the modular computer program an interactive visual indication of a user-attractive resource available on the computer network (page 1, paragraphs 7 and 11; and page 2, paragraph 3).

HFD does not expressly teach providing an incentive, independent of the dynamic pricing information, to use the modular computer program. However, Net Nanny discloses this limitation as discussed under claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 48, HFD teaches a computer-implemented method for encouraging users of a computer network to access a dynamic pricing system, the method comprising presenting a user-interface abstraction that displays dynamic pricing information collected from a plurality of sources the computer network and displays an interactive visual indication of a user-attractive resource available on the computer network (page 1, paragraphs 5, 7, 9 and 11; and page 2, paragraph 3).

HFD does not expressly teach providing an incentive, independent of the dynamic pricing information, to use the modular computer program. However, Net Nanny discloses this limitation as discussed under claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 4, 30 and 52, HFD further teaches the use of the Internet as the computer network upon which the applicant's system and method depends (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 5).

Regarding claims 29 and 51, HFD further teaches a modular computer program comprising instructions to receive dynamic pricing information from the computer network (page 1, paragraph 9).

Regarding claim 49, HFD teaches computer software, embodied in a tangible medium and/or in a propagated carrier signal, for encouraging users of a computer network to access a dynamic pricing system, the software comprising instructions to cause a computer system to present a user interface abstraction that displays dynamic pricing information collected from a plurality of sources on the computer network and displays an interactive visual indication of a user-attractive resource available on the computer network (page 1, paragraphs 5, 7, 9 and 11; and page 2, paragraph 3).

HFD does not expressly teach providing an incentive, independent of the dynamic pricing information, to use the modular computer program. However, Net Nanny discloses this limitation as discussed under claim 1 above.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD and Net Nanny in view of Sadowsky (US 6,123,737).

Regarding claim 6, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claim 1. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach distributing the modular computer program by pushing a copy of the modular computer program to one or more users of the computer network (page 1, paragraph 2). However, Sadowsky teaches a method for the automatically distributing software using push technology. At the time of Applicants' invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify HFD and Net Nanny to include the teachings of Sadowsky in that distributing the modular computer program by pushing a copy of the modular computer would enable HFD's dealer customers to automatically receive pricing software updates.

6. Claims 12, 33 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Official Notice.

Regarding claims 12, 33 and 55, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 11, 32 and 49. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the user can selectively view different levels of the taxonomy. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that providing a taxonomy, such as a browsing hierarchy, is old and well known. Therefore, at the time of Applicants' invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify HFD and Net Nanny to include providing users the ability to selectively view different levels of the taxonomy. The benefit of this combination would be to enable users to more easily locate pricing information.

7. Claims 10, 11, 32 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Martyn et al. (US 6,195,647) (“Martyn”).

Regarding claim 10, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claim 1. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach causing the modular computer program to display a stream of dynamic pricing information collected from the computer network. However, Martyn discloses displaying dynamic pricing information in ticker format (Abstract; and col. 2, lines 38-43). At the time of Applicants' invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify HFD and Net Nanny to include Martyn's teaching of causing the modular computer program to display a stream of dynamic pricing information collected from the computer network. This combination would enable HFD's dealer customers to access the real-time pricing data on a continuous basis without human interaction.

Regarding claims 11, 32 and 54, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 49. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach teach a method or system wherein the dynamic pricing information that is displayed varies based on user input. However, Martyn discloses a computer system for displaying dynamic pricing information wherein a user is permitted to modify the display setup according to a custom configuration (Abstract). At the time of Applicants invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify HFD and Net Nanny to include Martyn's teaching of varying the display of dynamic pricing

information based on user input. This combination would allow users to select and/or emphasize the most relevant pricing information.

8. Claims 2, 5, 9, 13-15, 21, 28, 31, 34-36, 42, 50, 53, 56-58 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Ng (Ng, M. *Tool Time, Travel Agent*, (August 7, 1997) p. 68).

Regarding claim 9, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claim 1. HFD and Net Nanny do not explicitly teach distributing the modular computer program by sending it to a user of the computer network through an instant messaging system. However, this limitation is well-known in the art. By modifying the teachings of HFD to include distributing the modular computer program by sending it to a user of the computer network through an instant messaging system, one of ordinary skill in the art would be permitted to instantly notify the user of the computer network that the modular computer program had been transmitted to him by email. Moreover, distributing the modular computer program by sending it to a user of the computer network through an instant messaging system would provide a heightened awareness of the modular computer program thereby increasing the user's interest.

Regarding claim 14, 35 and 57, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 49. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the interactive visual indication comprises an interactive link to the user-attractive resource. However, this limitation is well-known in the art. By modifying the teachings of HFD to include a method or system wherein the interactive visual indication comprises an interactive link to the user-attractive resource, one of

ordinary skill in the art would be permitted to quickly and accurately direct the user of the computer network to the user-attractive resource.

Regarding claim 15, HFD and Net Nanny do not explicitly teach a method wherein the interactive link comprises a uniform resource locator (URL) tag. However, this limitation is taught by well-known principles in the art as discussed under claims 36 and 58 above.

Regarding claims 2, 28 and 50, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 49. HFD and Net Nanny do not explicitly teach a modular computer program comprising a java-based applet. However, Ng teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 3). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of HFD to include a modular computer program comprising a java-based applet as taught by Ng. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of HFD to include a modular computer program comprising a java-based applet because this would facilitate the collection of user data.

Regarding claims 5, 31, and 53, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a computer network comprising a virtual private network. However, Ng teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 2). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a computer network comprising a virtual private network as taught by Ng. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings

of HFD to include a computer network comprising a virtual private network as taught by Ng because this would permit the applicant's system and method to be used in private network environments thereby expanding the potential market for applicant's method and system.

Regarding claims 13, 34 and 56, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the interactive visual indication comprises a glyph. However, Ng teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 7). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein the interactive visual indication comprises a glyph as taught in Ng. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein the interactive visual indication comprises a glyph because this would concisely convey information concerning the interactive visual indication.

Regarding claims 21, 42 and 64, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach providing a user with access to the user-attractive resource upon sensing that the user selected the interactive visual indication. However, Ng teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 7). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the teachings of HFD, to include providing a user with access to the user-attractive resource upon sensing that the user selected the interactive visual indication. By modifying HFD to include providing a user with access

to the user-attractive resource upon sensing that the user selected the interactive visual indication as taught in Ng, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to provide the user with additional information by using a visual indication as a trigger. Consequently, the method and/or system of the applicant's invention would be able to display pricing information without cluttering its display with additional information that is of no interest to the user.

Regarding claims 36 and 58, HFD, Net Nanny and Ng teach all the limitations discussed under claims 34 and 56. HFD, Net Nanny and Ng do not expressly teach the use of an interactive link comprising a uniform resource locator (URL) tag. However, it is notoriously well known in the art that interactive links often comprise a URL tag. Thus, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of HFD to include a method wherein the interactive link comprises a uniform resource locator (URL) tag in order to inform the user of the address to which the interactive link corresponds.

9. Claims 8, 23, 24, 44 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Samit (Samit, M. *Letting Prospects Sell Themselves, Marketing Computers* (April 1997), p. 73).

Regarding claim 8, HFD teaches all the limitations discussed under claim 1. HFD does not expressly teach distributing the modular computer program by sending it to a user of the computer network through an electronic mail system. However, Samit teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 5). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the

HFD article, to include the distributing the modular computer program by sending it to a user of the computer network through an electronic mail system as taught by Samit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include distributing the modular computer program by sending it to a user of the computer network through an electronic mail system as taught in Samit because this would allow the modular computer program to be distributed to the user of the computer network quickly. Moreover, by modifying the teachings of HFD to include distributing the modular computer program by sending it to a user of the computer network through an electronic mail system would reduce costs in that manufacturing and postage costs would be eliminated.

Regarding claims 23, 44 and 66, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not explicitly teach a method or system wherein a plurality of instances of the modular computer program are presented to a user concurrently. However, Samit teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 5; and page 2, paragraph 1). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein a plurality of instances of the modular computer program are presented to a user concurrently as taught in Samit. By modifying the teachings of HFD to include a method or system wherein a plurality of instances of the modular computer program are presented to a user concurrently, one of ordinary skill in the art would be permitted to present a variety of modular computer

programs to the user thereby increasing the likelihood that the user will be presented with a modular computer program that is of interest to the user.

Regarding claim 24, HFD further teaches a method wherein the modular computer program includes one or more associated visual indications of a user-attractive resource available on the computer network (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 7; and page 2, paragraph 4).

10. Claims 25, 26, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Samit and further in view of Gardenswartz et al. (US 6,055,573).

Regarding claims 25 and 46 HFD, Net Nanny and Samit teach all the limitations discussed under claims 24 and 44. HFD, Net Nanny and Samit do not expressly teach a method or system wherein each of the one or more visual indications can be the same as or different from the visual indications on other instances of the modular computer program. However, Gardenswartz et al. teach this limitation (col. 10, lines 24-30; and col. 11, lines 3-8 and 20-23). By modifying the teachings of HFD, Net Nanny and Samit, to include a method or system wherein each of the one or more visual indications can be the same as or different from the visual indications on other instances of the modular computer program as taught in Gardenswartz et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would be permitted to mix and match modular computer programs and visual indications according to the users' preference or frequency of selection of a particular visual indication.

Regarding claims 26 and 47, HFD, Net Nanny and Samit teach all the limitations discussed under claims 24 and 44. HFD, Net Nanny and Samit do not teach a method or system wherein each of the one or more visual indications can correspond to the same or different user attractive resources as the visual indications on other instances of the modular computer program. However, this limitation is taught by Gardenswartz et al. (col. 10, lines 24-30; and col. 11, lines 3-8 and 20-23). By modifying the teachings of HFD and Samit, to include a method or system wherein each of the one or more visual indications can correspond to the same or different user attractive resources as the visual indications on other instances of the modular computer program as taught by Gardenswartz et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would be permitted to customize the one or more modular computer program(s) according to user demand for a particular user-attractive resource.

11. Claims 16, 17, 37, 38, 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Donaldson (Donaldson, D. *Netting sales - use of Internet in retail trade, Do-It-Yourself Retailing*, Vol. 176, no. 1 (January 1999) p. 55).

Regarding claims 16, 37 and 59, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 14, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises a contest. However, Donaldson teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 10). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein the user-attractive

resource comprises a contest as taught by Donaldson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of HFD to include a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises a contest in order to provide users with an additional incentive to utilize the method and/or system claimed by the applicant.

Regarding claims 17, 38 and 60, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises a reward program. However, Donaldson teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraph 10). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises a reward program in order to encourage users to utilize the method and/or system claimed by the applicant.

12. Claims 18, 39 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Kay (Kay, E. *Flexed Pricing, Datamation*, Vol. 44, no. 2 (February 1998) p. 58).

Regarding claims 18, 39 and 61, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the user attractive resource comprises a coupon. However, Kay teaches this limitation (page 1). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein the user attractive resource

comprises a coupon as taught by Kay. By modifying the teachings of HFD to include a method or system wherein the user attractive resource comprises a coupon, one of ordinary skill in the art would be permitted to provide users with a discount thereby encouraging users to utilize the method and/or system claimed by the applicant.

13. Claims 19, 40 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Woods (Woods, B. *Web Marketplace – Halsey Minor keynote, Newsbytes, (April 12, 1996)*).

Regarding claims 19, 40 and 62, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises an advertisement. However, Woods teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 5). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises an advertisement in order to encourage user demand for the item or service depicted in the advertisement.

14. Claims 20, 41 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view of Net Nanny and Krantz (Krantz, M. *Custom-Designed Ads, Marketing Computers, Vol. 0, no. 0 (October 1993) p. 8*).

Regarding claims 20, 41 and 63, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 27 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises a multi-media presentation. However, Krantz teaches this limitation (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 3). At

the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the HFD article, to include a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises a multi-media presentation as taught by Krantz. By modifying the teachings of HFD to include a method or system wherein the user-attractive resource comprises a multi-media presentation, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been permitted to convey information to the user in a movie format thereby capturing the attention of the user.

15. Claims 22, 43, 45 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HFD in view Net Nanny and Kramer (Kramer, S. D. *More MSOs Use Web sites But How Well*, *Multichannel News*, Vol. 20, no. 25 (June 14, 1999) p. 40).

Regarding claims 22, 43 and 65, HFD and Net Nanny teach all the limitations discussed under claims 1, 43 and 48. HFD and Net Nanny do not expressly teach a method or system wherein the modular computer program displays dynamic pricing information in a ticker display format. However, Kramer teaches this limitation (page 3, paragraph 8). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of HFD, to include a method or system wherein the modular computer program displays dynamic pricing information in a ticker display format in order to provide the user with up-to-date pricing information.

Regarding claim 45, HFD further teaches a system wherein the modular computer program includes one or more associated visual indications of a user-

attractive resource available on the computer network (page 1, paragraphs 2 and 7; and page 2, paragraph 4).

Conclusion


16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tim Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-1912. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on (703) 308-1344. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Tim Brown
Examiner
Art Unit 3625

TB
June 1, 2003



Jeffrey A. Smith
Primary Examiner